

**U.S. Department of Education - EDCAPS  
G5-Technical Review Form (New)**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/13/11 12:00 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Temple University of the Commonwealth System of Higher Ed. (U411C110111)

**Reader #1:** \*\*\*\*\*

|  | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| <b>Questions</b>                         |                 |               |
| <b>Selection Criteria</b>                |                 |               |
| <b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b> |                 |               |
| 1. Project Evaluation                    | 20              | 19            |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                         | 20              | 19            |
| <b>Total</b>                             | 20              | 19            |

# Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - 84.411C Tier 2 Panel - 7: 84.411C

Reader #1: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Temple University of the Commonwealth System of Higher Ed. (U411C110111)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the project evaluation. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Note: We encourage eligible applicants to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation

(1) What Works Clearinghouse Procedures and Standards Handbook and

(2) IES/ NCEE Technical Methods papers.

### Strengths:

The evaluation process and activities are tightly aligned to the project goals stated in the application. A random control trial (RCT) in project year 4 should provide valid statistical data to evaluate the project impact on students and teachers.

The formative evaluation process and activities in project years 1-3 focus on the key project elements using a variety of measures for student outcomes. Thus, there should be sufficient data to improve project design and products prior to the RCT in year 4. Similarly, the progress monitoring and implementation fidelity measures address the research questions for Goal1 using targeted surveys and teacher observation. These are appropriate strategies and methods to examine the project impact on both students and teachers throughout each project year.

The instruments for assessing student language development are well researched and widely used.

The project products (i.e., online webinars and coaching process) are formatively evaluated and improved throughout the project, which should provide sufficient high quality information for further development and replication of the project.

The evaluation narrative clearly describes the use of statistical multivariate regression analyses (page 26) to assess the impact of the intervention on teacher quality. This is an appropriate method for data analysis for this project, given the number of outcome measures and the nesting of students within classrooms. Overall, the results from these analyses should provide sufficient information to validate the project impact on students and teachers.

### Weaknesses:

The application does not provide the specific overall evaluation budget. Combining amounts from various portions of the application suggest about \$70,000 is the total amount budgeted for evaluation activities (including assessment processes, data entry, analyses, and formative evaluation work). This amount

represents about 2% of the total grant budget, which would be a minimal amount to provide an effective project evaluation.

**Reader's Score:**     **19**

---

**Status:**           Submitted  
**Last Updated:**    10/13/11 12:00 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 10/13/11 12:00 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Temple University of the Commonwealth System of Higher Ed. (U411C110111)

**Reader #2:** \*\*\*\*\*

|  | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| <b>Questions</b>                         |                 |               |
| <b>Selection Criteria</b>                |                 |               |
| <b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b> |                 |               |
| 1. Project Evaluation                    | 20              | 19            |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                         | 20              | 19            |
| <b>Total</b>                             | 20              | 19            |

# Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - 84.411C Tier 2 Panel - 7: 84.411C

Reader #2: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Temple University of the Commonwealth System of Higher Ed. (U411C110111)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the project evaluation. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(3) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

**Note:** We encourage eligible applicants to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation

(1) What Works Clearinghouse Procedures and Standards Handbook and

(2) IES/ NCEE Technical Methods papers.

### Strengths:

The first three years of this program involve pilot-testing and formative assessment of the PD plan. During this time, there will be extensive video observation and formative assessment of the PD strategy. The strategy will be revised and hopefully improved thanks to the detailed data on the participating teachers' performance and usage of the online PD materials. The teachers will also complete written evaluations of each PD webinar. This feedback will be incorporated in the PD in years 2 and 3 so that the program can be rolled out on a larger scale in year 4, the year in which the efficacy trial will be conducted.

Thus, the first three years are essentially an extended implementation study or formative assessment, with a goal of building and improving the delivery of the PD for teachers of young ELL students. The evaluation of the trial is in year 4 and will include 20 classrooms each at 3 levels of schooling (PK, K, 1). Half of these classrooms will have teachers trained with the PD while half will not. They will be randomly assigned. Authors will then assess the classroom practices using well-known and appropriate assessment tools. These instruments are well documented in the proposal. This is a strength of the proposal. The student outcomes will also be measured pre and post, using well known and valid measures such as the PPVT and the PALS.

The strongest aspect of this proposal is the random assignment evaluation design. There will be a credible comparison group of teachers and students to serve as the counterfactual. Those not selected into the program will serve as a perfect comparison group. Thus, at the end of the day, the researchers will have strong evidence as to whether this strategy works at improving teacher practice and student learning for young ELL students.

The rich data gathered during the extensive implementation study and formative study in years 1-3 will most certainly provide sufficient information on the key elements of the program.

Regarding resources, the proposal describes an independent evaluator with appropriate experience in the area. Further, there is a good deal of data provided on the resources allocated to different aspects of the evaluation in year 4.

**Weaknesses:**

One weakness is that the external evaluator appears to be involved in collecting the formative data in years 1-3, but the budget narrative seems to only describe the evaluation resources required in year 4. More clarity is needed here.

One final possible criticism is that this project incorporates three years of planning/formative study for a one year efficacy trial with 60 total teachers across two sites. Perhaps the efficacy trial could begin a year sooner so a larger N could be used to perhaps have more power to detect potential program effects.

**Reader's Score:** 19

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 10/13/11 12:00 AM